

**FLATHEAD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
JULY 8, 2020**

CALL TO ORDER A meeting of the Flathead County Planning Board was called to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. at South Campus Building, 40 11th Street W, Ste. 200, Kalispell, Montana. Board members present were Dean Sirucek, Greg Stevens, Sandra Nogal, Jeff Larsen, Elliot Adams, and Kevin Lake. Ron Schlegel had an excused absence. Jim Thompson and Mike Horn had unexcused absences. Erin Appert, Erik Mack, and Mark Mussman represented the Flathead County Planning & Zoning Office.

6:00 PM

There were 17 members of the public in attendance.

**APPROVAL OF
MEETING
MINUTES**

6:01 PM

Stevens made a motion, seconded by Sirucek, to approve the June 10, 2020 meeting minutes.

Lake noted the drafted minutes said he was present and he had not been at that meeting. It was noted and would be amended.

Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**
*(Public matters that
are within the
jurisdiction of the
Board 2-3-103
M.C.A)*
6:02 PM

None

**DISCLOSURE OF
ANY CONFLICT
OF INTERESTS**
6:02 PM

Larsen disclosed he had worked on the subdivision on Mare Lane, for a previous owner, but did not have a relationship with the current owner. He did not believe he needed to step down as a conflict of interest but wanted to disclose that information.

**MARE LANE
ESTATES
PHASE I
(FZC-20-09)**
6:03 PM

A zone change request from Mare Lane Estates Phase I with technical assistance from Sands Surveying, Inc. for property in the Willow Glen Zoning District. The proposal would change the zoning on property located at Assessor #0504465 (Open Space), Assessor #0850700 (Tract 4X), 123, 125, 127, 129, 131, 133, 135, and 137 South Cedar Drive, Kalispell, MT from R-1 PUD (*Mare Lane Estates R-1 PUD*) to R-5 (*Two Family Residential*). The total acreage involved in the request is approximately 15.7 acres.

STAFF REPORT
6:04 PM

Erik Mack reviewed staff report FZC-20-09 for the board.

BOARD
QUESTIONS
6:05 PM

Sirucek asked staff to explain the floodplain map. Staff explained the open space was within the floodplain.

Larsen asked staff to clarify if it was ok to split the PUD. It was the staff's understanding that the entire PUD would be a part of the zone change and would ultimately go away.

Nogal asked for clarity on the PUD and staff explained that it would go away and would be considered R-2.5 zoning. The existing residential lots would still be larger than the minimum lot size for R-5. They would still be in compliance with the new zoning.

Sirucek asked if it was in compliance with their setbacks. Staff said that had been a concern that was brought up by the public comment in regards to use (for example the horses on the property). Those would be grandfathered in. Sirucek asked if there would be a conflict between PUD and [inaudible]. Mack replied not a whole lot of difference.

Larsen explained the PUD had been done in an attempt to get cluster developments. Staff agreed and noted the future open space could be developed, however, there was the floodplain issue which would need to be addressed.

Larsen asked what could be developed in the floodplain, as it was now. Staff explained there could be floodplain development. Larsen asked if they could add fill to the whole parcel in order develop. Mussman said the problem would be with the water and sewer. Most of the property was located within the regulated flood hazard area. If someone was ambitious and wanted to fill the entire area [they could]. It would be challenging to have the appropriate engineering and certifications, to get approval. Most of the open space could not be subdivided due to the regulations that required a certain amount of buildable area outside of the special flood hazard area.

Larsen inquired about the wetlands on the map. Staff did not know if it would be considered jurisdictional wetlands or not. Mussman believed it would be because there was some development activity adjacent to the north, where fill was brought in, and there had been Army Corp of Engineers issues. There were nearby jurisdictional wetlands, especially along Spring Creek and a great degree to the west.

**APPLICANT
PRESENTATION
6:13 PM**

Eric Mulcahy with Sands Surveying, 2 Village Loop, represented the applicants and explained the intent of the zone change. They did not intend to develop it into [what] R-5 [was capable of]. They wanted to put a couple of cabins in, outside of the floodplain, and potentially a couple of RV spaces in the open space within the flood plain. That was one of the few uses that were allowed to be created within a floodplain and with a floodplain permit. He had gone to all the owners who lived in the subdivision and they had signed off on it.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS
6:16 PM**

Larsen asked where the location of the cabin would go. Mulcahy believed the southwest corner was what had been discussed.

Adams asked how many cabins they expected to go in there. Mulcahy said it would be for family only.

Wayne Everett, 34 Shady Lane, was the applicant and said the cabins would be for family only. He explained the history behind the property. They wanted to keep the property together. They had enjoyed it the way it was and wanted to continue that. The wetland was fenced off and he did not want to change it. He pointed out on the map where he wanted to put down cabins. They frequently used it with RVs to have a family gathering and enjoy the property. There were horses on the property to keep the grass down. He wanted to keep it for family and have a place where they could come and park their RV's and cabins. He had 14 acres of backyard to enjoy.

**AGENCY
COMMENTS
6:19 PM**

There were no public agencies present to comment. Staff reviewed the written comments during the staff report presentation.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT
6:19 PM**

Henry Cooper 143 S. Cedar, spoke in opposition of the application. He discussed the history of the property, including the 1964 flood which had caused fatalities. He did not want that to happen again and felt they needed to be prepared with a pre-disaster mitigation plan and sound floodplain management. He was concerned for the people who were within the floodplain. He was also concerned for the health and safety for the people and the use of the high aquifer and the sewer waste issue. He wanted to preserve the floodplains and to prepare for the worst.

Sarah Yerkes, 147 S. Cedar Dr., spoke in opposition of the application. She was concerned that the future of this R-5 zoning would be a mobile home park (like others in the area).

Elaine Joern, 159 S. Cedar Dr., spoke in opposition of the application. She had horses on the property. She was disappointed in the proposed R-5 zoning and did not understand why it needed to be such a high density with what they

were proposing. She was afraid that it would turn into an RV park or mobile home park, like those nearby which had been developed in her back yard. She was concerned livestock would no longer be allowed. She was concerned over the open space being developed. She expressed that there had been a reason why the PUD was put in place. She loved that the applicant loved the property but was concerned about the future of the property should it change hands.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS
6:31 PM**

Stevens asked Cooper to clarify his statement and asked if the children who died in the flood were within the Flathead County. Cooper clarified they were mostly from the Blackfeet Reservation.

Sirucek asked Mulcahy if they had considered any other zoning besides R-5. Mulcahy explained the reason why they went with R-5 was because they wanted to have some RV's and Cabins. Mulcahy addressed the floodplain concerns. He also explained this area was served by public sewer and water. He addressed any type of development that might happen 20 years down the road would trigger a whole subdivision review process. He explained that they could not create a subdivision within a floodplain, as it was deemed irresponsible. There was a slight chance that someone could do a LOMA and fill the whole thing but that would also trigger a public process and he did not believe that it would be permitted. Some of those fears would be addressed through existing regulations and sewer and water capabilities. The applicant was really viewing it as a recreational site for his family.

Adams asked how many cabins would fit within the R-5 outside of the floodplain. Mulcahy said they had only talked about 2-3 cabins but they had not looked at maximizing the density.

Larsen asked how many RV sites. Everett replied about 5-6 so that his family could take part. He wanted to do something for the family's future.

Stevens asked if he would need to go through subdivision review for an RV court. Larsen said they could put 5 cabins in before going through subdivision review but if it was RV park, it would not be exempt. The process for cabins would not be too bad. It had a preliminary plat for 7 houses but they would not want to go over 5 because then they would have to go through subdivision review. He expressed it would be a complicated process to put the RV's in.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL/
COMMENTS
6:38 PM**

Everett addressed some of the public concerns. He had a long history with the property and did not want to have a mobile home park there. He worked for Evergreen Water and Sewer and knew there was a line running through his property. He wanted to create a space that friends and family could enjoy. He also liked having horses on the property. He said he would not subdivide one inch of the property. He also addressed the concern of sewage within the floodplain. There were three wells on the property. The sewer was already in place. There would only be 1 year round cabin so the person living there

	could watch the property.
STAFF REBUTTAL/ COMMENTS 6:44 PM	None
MAIN MOTION TO ADOPT F.O.F. (FZC-20-09) 6:44 PM	Sirucek made a motion, seconded by Nogal, to adopt staff report FZC-20-09 as findings of fact.
BOARD DISCUSSION 6:44 PM	None
ROLL CALL TO ADOPT F.O.F. (FZC-20-09) 6:44 PM	Motion was passed unanimously on a roll call vote.
MAIN MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL (FZC-20-09) 6:45 PM	Sirucek made a motion, seconded by Lake, to recommend approval of FZC-20-09 to the Board of County Commissioners.
BOARD DISCUSSION 6:45 PM	None
ROLL CALL TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL (FZC-20-09) 6:45 PM	The motion passed on a 5-1 roll call vote. Nogal dissented.
COUNTRYSIDE ESTATES PHASE 2 (FPP-20-10) 6:46 PM	A request from Sands Surveying, Inc., on behalf of Robert & Donna Fink Living Trust, for preliminary plat approval of Countryside Estates Phase 2, a proposal to create 38 residential lots and 2 commercial lots on 49.769 acres. The proposal would be served by a public water system and individual septic systems. The property is located at 3240 Highway 35.

STAFF REPORT
6:46 PM

Erik Mack reviewed staff report FPP-20-10 for the board.

BOARD
QUESTIONS
6:49 PM

None

APPLICANT
PRESENTATION
6:49 PM

Eric Mulcahy with Sands Surveying, 2 Village Loop, represented the applicants. He gave the history of the preliminary plat phase 1. They would be required to work with MDOT for traffic. They had worked with Creston Fire Dept. and installed their fire suppression system. The primary difference between the 1st phase and the second was that the first was on individual wells and the 2nd phase would be on a public water system.

BOARD
QUESTIONS
6:51 PM

None

AGENCY
COMMENTS
6:51 PM

There were no public agencies present to comment. Staff reviewed the written comments during the staff report presentation.

PUBLIC
COMMENT
6:52 PM

Harold Clark, 905 Middle Rd., spoke in opposition of the application. He was concerned about the traffic impact that would be added to the intersection. He was concerned about safety.

Cline Leuning, 166 Ridgeview Dr., spoke in opposition of the application. He owned lots in Phase I. He was concerned about excessive traffic on the south end access.

Jerry Leuning, Lots 14 and 15 of Phase I, spoke in opposition of the application. They were told that Phase 2 would mirror Phase 1 but now they were proposing more density. He was concerned about the increase of traffic and even more so when Phase 3 came in. He was also concerned that they would have a decrease in property values when the higher density comes in.

BOARD
QUESTIONS
6:57 PM

Nogal asked what the original lot size for Phase 1 was. Mulcahy discussed the lot size in detail and explained they had looked at mirroring the previous phase but they were now on the public water system because DEQ had tightened their requirements. This meant they had to create more density to address the economics of putting pipe in the ground to access all those lots. The lot size were still over an acre.

**MAIN MOTION
TO ADOPT F.O.F.
(FPP-20-10)
6:59 PM**

Nogal made a motion, seconded by Lake, to adopt staff report FPP-20-10 as findings of fact.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION
6:59 PM**

Adam asked about finding number 1 which addressed having a minimal impact on agriculture and clarified the property was used as a tree nursery and wanted that noted.

**MOTION TO
AMEND F.O.F. #1
7:02 PM**

Adams motioned, seconded by Nogal, to amend finding of fact #1 to state:

1. There would be minimal impact on agriculture or agricultural water user facilities as a result of the proposed subdivision because the property is currently not used for agriculture, has no irrigation infrastructure on site, is not in an irrigation district, and is not party to any irrigation agreements.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION
7:02 PM**

None

**ROLL CALL TO
AMEND F.O.F. #1
7:02 PM**

Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FPP-20-10)
7:03 PM**

Motion was passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

**MAIN MOTION
TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL
(FPP-20-10)
7:03 PM**

Lake made a motion, seconded by Stevens, to recommend approval of FPP-20-10 to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION
7:03 PM**

Larsen wanted the concern over density to be discussed. Stevens did not recall the conversation on how phase II would relate to phase I, however, he understood the road concerns.

Mulcahy was willing to address it. The access at the rear was always intended to loop, which had been recommended by the fire department as well. It was encouraged to connect subdivisions. Given that they had access to highway 35, it made sense to tie in the development on the backside. There were a few more houses being built but generally, traffic was still going to go the shortest

distance as opposed to circulating around the entire subdivision. The frontage road was a requirement by staff and was reiterated by Commissioners.

Larsen asked if there had been a discussion about Phase 2. Mulcahy said it was a stand alone at the time.

Larsen struggled because he sympathized with the neighbors because a density pattern had been set and this was different. He struggled with how he wanted to vote on it. It was nice to keep the same pattern once development started.

Adams understood the concern over traffic coming on to Highway 35 was going to be a little difficult. He understood the concern.

Nogal understood the frustrations from the buyers who were told something to now find out it was going to be different.

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL
(FPP-20-10)
7:09 PM**

The motion failed on a 2-4 vote. Larsen, Nogal, Stevens, and Sirucek dissented.

**MOTION TO
RECOMMEND
DENIAL
(FPP-20-10)
7:10 PM**

Stevens made a motion, seconded by Sirucek, to forward a negative recommendation of FPP-20-10 to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION
7:10 PM**

None

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND
DENIAL
7:10 PM**

Motion passed on a 4-2 vote. Adams and Lake dissented.

**JUMP RESERVE
PROPERTIES
(FZC-20-10)
7:12 PM**

A zone change request from Jump Reserve Properties for property in the Evergreen Zoning District. The proposal would change the zoning on property located at 2651 and 2655 Highway 2, Kalispell, MT from *I-1H (Light Industrial Highway)* and *SAG-10 (Suburban Agricultural)* to *I-1H (Light Industrial Highway)* and *R-4 (Two Family Residential)*. The total acreage involved in the request is approximately 29.08 acres.

STAFF REPORT

Erik Mack reviewed staff report FZC-20-10 for the board.

7:12 PM

**BOARD
QUESTIONS
7:14 PM**

Sirucek asked about the neighborhood plan and asked if had any “teeth” to it. Mack explained that the document was non-regulatory but gave guidelines.

**APPLICANT
PRESENTATION
7:15 PM**

Eric Mulcahy with Sands Surveying, 2 Village Loop, represented the applicants. He gave the reasoning and intent behind the zone change. There was development occurring that will mirror Trumble Creek Crossing. They were straightening out and creating predictability in future development.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS
7:17 PM**

Sirucek said that all that was on the table was a zone change and not the future development. Mulcahy confirmed that and explained the zone change would determine a land swap. Sirucek asked if the neighborhood plan was a requirement. He discussed Trumble Creek Crossing and phasing and this was baby step phasing to get to that point.

Stevens said they had run into this issue before (on Church Dr.). The property had been rezoned right across from the city limits. The issue came up that they wanted a zone change and did not have a development proposal, however, they needed the zone change to come up with the proposal. Stevens discussed that the precedent had been set that people needed to have a zone change before they could go through the process of developing. They also discussed the neighborhood plan being a non-regulatory document.

**AGENCY
COMMENTS
7:21 PM**

There were no public agencies present to comment. Staff reviewed the written comments during the staff report presentation.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT
7:22 PM**

Chris Strand, 178 Welmar Way, spoke in opposition of the application. He asked for clarification as to what would be developed. He was concerned about the traffic impact on Reserve Drive. It was already bad and any additional development would only make it worse. He was concerned about rezoning it and increasing the density. He was also concerned that the property values would decrease. He understood that Kalispell was growing. He could be more on board with single family but was concerned the traffic impact that multi-family housing would bring. He did not think the current road infrastructure could handle the density increase.

Chris Cox, 150 St. Regis Drive, spoke in opposition of the application. He had the same concerns as Strand. He also discussed the HOA that they were part of and wondered if they could maintain the same standards for the future development as what they had.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL/
COMMENTS
7:27 PM**

Mulcahy clarified that the driver behind this was the developer beyond Trumble Creek. The zoning was the identical zoning that phase 2-5 would be developed on and would be similar. There would be continuity. He couldn't say exactly what was going on that sliver of property but a lot of it was just trying to protect the residential development that was already occurring from potentially an inappropriate light industrial use in that area.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL/
COMMENTS
7:28 PM**

Mack said that one of the conditions of Phase 2-5 was that they were to build a road, between Rose Crossing, in order to take some of the traffic pressure off of Reserve. They discussed it in details.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS
7:30 PM**

None

**MAIN MOTION
TO ADOPT F.O.F.
(FZC-20-10)
7:30 PM**

Sirucek made a motion, seconded by Nogal, to adopt staff report FZC-20-10 as findings of fact.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION
7:30 PM**

None

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F.
(FZC-20-10)
7:30 PM**

Motion was passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

**MAIN MOTION
TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL
(FZC-20-10)
7:30 PM**

Adams made a motion, seconded by Nogal, to recommend approval of FZC-20-10 to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION
7:31 PM**

Stevens said the project (Trumble Creek) was a go whether the zone change occurred or not. Mulcahy confirmed that was the case. He said the comments in regards to traffic appeared to be moot because the phases were already going in. The development pattern had been set. The zone change would not have much of an impact. They were only looking at the zone change.

Larsen pointed out that it was an industrial zone right now. He would rather have the R-4 next to them vs. the industrial. It appeared the developer was

creating a natural buffer between the two zones. He was in favor and felt the road going north will help a lot with the traffic. He did think in the long run that it would be a benefit to have residential over the industrial which could devalue the property. He thought what they were doing was a good thing.

Sirucek felt that the buffer, right adjacent to those homes, and not having a small industrial would be a net benefit. He was in favor of the amendment.

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL
(FZC-20-10)
7:36 PM**

The motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote

**AMENDED
SUBDIVISION
PLAT OF LOT 1A,
HOMES ON A
THOUSAND
HILLS
(FPP-20-12)
7:36 PM**

A request from John & Molly Schwarz (Homes on a Thousand Hills), with technical assistance from Thousand Hills Landworks and Environmental Health Consulting, for preliminary plat approval of the Amended Subdivision Plat of Lot 1A, Homes on a Thousand Hills, a proposal to create 6 residential lots on approximately 32 acres. The proposal would be served by individual wells and septic systems. Access to each lot would be from Shepherd Trail and a new internal subdivision road. The property is located at 145 Shepherd Trail, Kalispell, MT.

**STAFF REPORT
7:37 PM**

Erin Appert reviewed staff report FPP-20-12 for the board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS
7:37 PM**

Sirucek asked about the letter from the West Valley Fire Department and wondered if it was covered under condition #2. He wondered if the condition needed to be more specific to reflect what had been requested by the West Valley Fire Department.

Larsen noted that sometimes the fire department words their response in such a way that there was no room and sometimes they can be worked with.

Lake asked what the size of the lot just north of it was. Applicant said that he could address that.

**APPLICANT
PRESENTATION
7:42 PM**

John Schwarz, 3248 Farm to Market Road, was the applicant and provided a brief history of the subject property and surrounding lots, and their reasoning for the proposed size and density of lots. He spoke with the fire chief and clarified only one tanker recharger station is required which can be shared by the proposed subdivision and the adjacent proposed subdivision.

Molly Schwarz, 3248 Farm to Market Road, who was also the applicant, pointed to the proposed preliminary plat to show the adjacent property from

	which written public comment was received.
BOARD QUESTIONS 7:46 PM	None
AGENCY COMMENTS 7:46 PM	There were no public agencies present to comment. Staff reviewed the written comments during the staff report presentation.
PUBLIC COMMENT 7:46 PM	None
APPLICANT REBUTTAL/ COMMENTS 7:46 PM	None
STAFF REBUTTAL/ COMMENTS 7:47 PM	None
MAIN MOTION TO ADOPT F.O.F. (FPP-20-12) 7:47 PM	Lake made a motion, seconded by Stevens, to adopt staff report FPP-20-12 as findings of fact.
BOARD DISCUSSION 7:47 PM	None
ROLL CALL TO ADOPT F.O.F. (FPP-20-12) 7:47 PM	Motion was passed unanimously on a roll call vote.
MAIN MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL (FPP-20-12) 7:48 PM	Stevens made a motion, seconded by Sirucek, to recommend approval of FPP-20-12 to the Board of County Commissioners.
BOARD	Sirucek wanted to amend condition #2 and discussed the language he wanted

DISCUSSION
7:48 PM

used.

**MOTION TO
AMEND
CONDITION #2**
7:48 PM

Sirucek motioned, seconded by Nogal, to amend condition #2 to state:
The developer shall comply with reasonable fire suppression, ~~and~~, access, ~~and~~
fire equipment development requirements of the West Valley Fire District. A
letter from the fire chief stating that the plat meets the requirements of the Fire
District (or Department) shall be submitted with the application for Final Plat.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**
7:49 PM

Sirucek discussed that he wanted there to be a link between the letter [from the
fire chief] and the condition. Board discussion ensued regarding whether the
amendment was necessary. Sirucek addressed staff regarding amending
Condition #2. Mussman responded the condition as written in the staff report
was likely sufficient given the requirement for a letter from the fire chief at
final plat. The motion was rescinded.

**MOTION
RESCINDED**
7:51 PM

Sirucek and Nogal rescinded the motion.

**ROLL CALL TO
RECOMMEND
APPROVAL
(FPP-20-12)**
7:51 PM

The motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote

**AMENDED
SUBDIVISION
PLAT OF LOT 2,
HOME ON A
THOUSAND
HILLS
(FPP-20-13)**
7:52 PM

A request from John & Molly Schwarz (Homes on a Thousand Hills), with
technical assistance from Thousand Hills Landworks and Environmental
Health Consulting, for preliminary plat approval of the Amended Subdivision
Plat of Lot 2, Homes on a Thousand Hills, a proposal to create 4 residential
lots on approximately 20 acres. The proposal would be served by individual
wells and septic systems. Access to each lot would be from Shepherd Trail.
The property is located at 197 Shepherd Trail, Kalispell.

STAFF REPORT
7:52 PM

Erin Appert reviewed staff report FPP-20-13 for the board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**
7:53 PM

None

**APPLICANT
PRESENTATION**
7:53 PM

John Schwarz, 3248 Farm To Market Road, was the applicant and stated a
fence had been constructed along Lot 3 of Homes on a Thousand Hills

	Subdivision at the request of the adjoining property owner. The proposal included one large lot and three smaller lots.
BOARD QUESTIONS <i>7:54 PM</i>	None
AGENCY COMMENTS <i>7:54 PM</i>	There were no public agencies present to comment. Staff reviewed the written comments during the staff report presentation.
PUBLIC COMMENT <i>7:54 PM</i>	None
BOARD QUESTIONS <i>7:55 PM</i>	None
MAIN MOTION TO ADOPT F.O.F. (FPP-20-13) <i>7:55 PM</i>	Sirucek made a motion, seconded by Adams, to adopt staff report FPP-20-13 as findings of fact.
BOARD DISCUSSION <i>7:55 PM</i>	None
ROLL CALL TO ADOPT F.O.F. (FPP-20-13) <i>7:55 PM</i>	Motion was passed unanimously on a roll call vote.
MAIN MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL (FPP-20-13) <i>7:55 PM</i>	Lake made a motion, seconded by Sirucek, to recommend approval of FPP-20-13 to the Board of County Commissioners.
BOARD DISCUSSION <i>7:56 PM</i>	None
ROLL CALL TO RECOMMEND	The motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote

APPROVAL
(FPP-20-13)
7:56 PM

OLD BUSINESS
7:56 PM

Mussman discussed that the Commissioners rescinded the Columbia Falls and Kalispell City-Master Plan which had been discussed by the board earlier. He also discussed that the PUD and the scenic corridor amendment was in the public comment process.

NEW BUSINESS
7:57 PM

Mussman discussed the possibility of having a sub-committee to help assist with the preparation and response to the AG discussion [with the Planning Board]. The bi-laws allowed the planning board to allow various committees. This request will formally be made when they attend the September meeting.

Larsen and Stevens discussed, with Mark, being uncomfortable with approving a committee without them being appointed by the Commissioners. Stevens made the argument that board members could appoint other board members to a subcommittee but did not feel it was appropriate to appoint people outside of those who were appointed by Commissioners. They discussed this at great length.

ADJOURNMENT
8:28 PM

The meeting was adjourned on a motion by Nogal and Larsen at approximately 8:28 p.m. The next meeting will be held August 12, 2019.



Jeff Larsen, Chairman



Angela Phillips, Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED/CORRECTED: 8 / 12 /20